tinic doctrine may well pass for a commentary upon Empedocles, accordingly as Simplicius briefly represents his sense, 'E/z-Cc&u.i. c, 10. p. 71.

7r£oo/cAr?c *cvo KOff[JLQv<; GvviGTrjGi, rov* juev fjvtOyUe-ej;t. Gnec.

Vfiift 1 ^Qfi

VOV K.CLL VOriT&V) TOV* 06 *CLdKSKplfJltVOV KCLl CLLCf\jr\ TOV^

KCU fv rovr^> KOcrjutw rr/v evwcrtv O£><£ /cat TTJV Stct-icpKrtv' Empedocles makes two worlds, the one united and intelligible, the other divided and sensible; and in this lower sensible world, he takes notice both of unity and discord.—

It was before observed,, that Heraclitus likewise did assert a regular and artificial nature, as the fate of things in this lower world; for his " reason passing through the substance of all things," or *[c] ethereal body, which was the seed of the generation of the universe/' was nothing but that spermatic or plastic nature which we now speak of. And whereas there is an odd passage of this philosopher's recorded,[a] KOCT/XOV rovSs ovre rtc Oealc ov *r avOpuTruv iirQU)c>t,* that neither any God nor man made this world,—-which, as it is justly derided by Plutarch for its simplicity, so it looks very atheistically at first sight;. yet, because Heraclitus hath not been accounted an Atheist, we therefore conceive the meaning of it to have been this, that the world was not made by any whatsoever, after such a manner as an artificer makes aiiquse, by machines and engines, acting from without upon the matter, cumbersomely andmoliminously, but by a certain inward plastic natpre of its own.

And as Hippocrates followed Heraclitus in this (as was before declared), so did Zeno and the Stoics also; they supposing, besides an Intel-

[a] Apud Plutarch, de Animaa Procreat ex Timaeo, tom.[4]ii. oper. p* 1014. et apud Clement. Alexandrin. Stromat. lib. v. cap. xiv. p. 711.